



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2018

---

## **Experimentally simulating warmer and wetter climate additively improves rangeland quality on the Tibetan Plateau**

Xu, Wei ; Zhu, Mengyao ; Zhang, Zhenhua ; Ma, Zhiyuan ; Liu, Huiying ; Chen, Litong ; Cao,  
Guangmin ; Zhao, Xinquan ; Schmid, Bernhard ; He, Jin-Sheng

**Abstract:** The vast expanses of rangeland on the Tibetan Plateau, which support the livelihood of c. 9.8 million local inhabitants, have experienced rapid climate warming over the past 50 years. At the same time, precipitation has increased in large parts of the Plateau but decreased in other parts, particularly in the northwest. These trends are predicted to continue into the future. However, their potential effects on rangeland quality remain unclear. We conducted a two-factor field experiment in which we manipulated temperature (control or warming by 1.5–1.8°C) and precipitation (control or 50% reduction or increase in rainfall) in an alpine grassland on the northeastern Tibetan Plateau, starting in 2011. From 2014 to 2016, we measured forage production and community composition, and in 2015 forage quality (crude protein, cell-soluble contents, hemicellulose, cellulose, lignin and digestibility) was represented by seven abundant species. Overall, warming did not change total forage production at plant community level, but increased legume production and decreased non-legume forage production. Increased and reduced precipitation enhanced and decreased forage production by 18.2% and 12.9% respectively. Increased precipitation in particular increased grass and sedge production, but not legume production. Forage quality showed species-specific responses to the simulated climate changes. At community level, warming and reduced precipitation improved forage quality, which were mainly caused by a shift in community composition towards more legumes, rather than the direct effects of simulated climate changes. Meanwhile, increased precipitation did not reduce forage quality, despite the precipitation-induced increase in forage production. Integrating forage production and quality into nutrient production as a measure of rangeland quality, we found that warming and increased precipitation additively improved rangeland quality, while reduced precipitation decreased it. **Synthesis and applications.** Rangeland quality, an important ecosystem provisioning service, will benefit from a warmer climate on the Tibetan Plateau in the regions with a predicted increase in precipitation, but not in those regions where precipitation might be reduced in the future. We suggest management strategies, including reseeded native legumes, establishing sustainable pastures and assisting the exchange of harvested forage, to cope with the challenges posed by these different climate change scenarios.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13066>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-151388>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Xu, Wei; Zhu, Mengyao; Zhang, Zhenhua; Ma, Zhiyuan; Liu, Huiying; Chen, Litong; Cao, Guangmin; Zhao, Xinquan; Schmid, Bernhard; He, Jin-Sheng (2018). Experimentally simulating warmer and wetter climate additively improves rangeland quality on the Tibetan Plateau. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 55(3):1486-1497.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13066>

1    **Experimentally simulating warmer and wetter climate additively improves rangeland**  
2    **quality on the Tibetan Plateau**

3    Wei Xu<sup>1</sup>, Mengyao Zhu<sup>1</sup>, Zhenhua Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Zhiyuan Ma<sup>1</sup>, Huiying Liu<sup>1</sup>, Litong Chen<sup>2</sup>,  
4    Guangmin Cao<sup>2</sup>, Xinquan Zhao<sup>2</sup>, Bernhard Schmid<sup>3</sup>, Jin-Sheng He<sup>1,2\*</sup>

5    <sup>1</sup>*Department of Ecology, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, and Key*  
6    *Laboratory for Earth Surface Processes of the Ministry of Education, Peking University,*  
7    *Beijing 100871, China*

8    <sup>2</sup>*Key Laboratory of Adaptation and Evolution of Plateau Biota, Northwest Institute of*  
9    *Plateau Biology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xining 810008, China*

10    <sup>3</sup>*Institute of Environmental Sciences, University of Zurich, Zurich CH-8057, Switzerland.*

11  
12    **Running title:** Responses of the Tibetan rangeland to climate change

13  
14    **\*Correspondence author:**

15    Jin-Sheng He

16    E-mail: [jshe@pku.edu.cn](mailto:jshe@pku.edu.cn), Tel: +86-10-6275-4404, Fax: +86-10-6275-8684.

17    **Email address of other authors:** Wei Xu ([xuwei2014@pku.edu.cn](mailto:xuwei2014@pku.edu.cn)), Mengyao Zhu  
18    ([zhumy.16b@igsrr.ac.cn](mailto:zhumy.16b@igsrr.ac.cn)), Zhenhua Zhang ([zhenhua@nwipb.cas.cn](mailto:zhenhua@nwipb.cas.cn)), Zhiyuan Ma  
19    ([mazhiyuan@pku.edu.cn](mailto:mazhiyuan@pku.edu.cn)), Huiying Liu ([huiying@pku.edu.cn](mailto:huiying@pku.edu.cn)), Litong Chen  
20    ([litong\\_chen@nwipb.cas.cn](mailto:litong_chen@nwipb.cas.cn)), Guangmin Cao ([caogm@nwipb.cas.cn](mailto:caogm@nwipb.cas.cn)), Xinquan Zhao  
21    ([xqzhao@nwipb.cas.cn](mailto:xqzhao@nwipb.cas.cn)), Bernhard Schmid ([bernhard.schmid@ieu.uzh.ch](mailto:bernhard.schmid@ieu.uzh.ch)).

22    **Word count:**

23    Entire paper: 6947, summary: 346, main text: 4480, acknowledgements: 52, references:  
24    1616, tables and figure legends: 453.

25    **Tables:** 2

26    **Figures:** 6

27    **References:** 56

## Summary

1. The vast expanses of rangeland on the Tibetan Plateau, which support the livelihood of ~9.8 million local inhabitants, have experienced rapid climate warming and increased overall precipitation over the past 50 years and these trends are predicted to continue into the future. However, their potential effects on rangeland quality remain unclear.
2. We conducted a two-factor field experiment in which we manipulated temperature (control or warming by 1.5–1.8 °C) and precipitation (control or 50% reduction or increase in rainfall) at an alpine grassland on north-eastern Tibetan Plateau starting in 2011. From 2014–2016, we measured forage production and community composition, and in 2015 forage quality (crude protein, cell soluble contents, hemicellulose, cellulose, lignin and digestibility) represented by seven abundant species.
3. Overall, warming did not change total forage production at plant community level, but increased legume production and decreased non-legume forb production. Increased and reduced precipitation enhanced and decreased forage production by 18.2% and 12.9%, respectively. From dry to wet, increasing precipitation increased grass and sedge production, but tended to decrease legume production.
4. Forage quality showed species-specific responses to the simulated climate changes. At community level, warming and reduced precipitation improved forage quality, which was mainly caused by a shift in community composition towards more legumes, rather than the direct effects of simulated climate changes. Increased precipitation did not reduce forage quality, despite the precipitation-induced increase in forage production.
5. Integrating forage production and quality into nutrient production as a measure of

rangeland quality, we found that warming and increased precipitation additively improved rangeland quality, while reduced precipitation decreased it.

6. *Synthesis and applications.* Rangeland quality, as one important ecosystem provisioning service, will benefit from a warmer climate on the Tibetan Plateau in the regions with predicted increase in precipitation, but not in those regions where precipitation might be reduced in the future. We suggest management strategies, including reseeding native legumes and popularizing artificial pastures in the mesic and wetter areas, and establishing regional forage reserves and decreasing stocking rate in the drier area, to best adapt to these different climate-change scenarios.

**Key-words:** alpine rangeland; climate change; forage production; forage quality; precipitation; Tibetan grasslands; warming

## Introduction

Climate change will not only affect ecosystem structure and functioning (Ponce-Campos et al., 2013; Reichstein et al., 2013), but also the provisioning of ecosystem services such as forage production (Pettorelli, 2012; Polley et al., 2013). These changes could be particularly profound in high-elevation ecosystems (Chen et al., 2013). The Tibetan Plateau has experienced a rapid climate change over the past 50 years (Dong, Jiang, Zheng & Zhang, 2012). Air temperatures have been rising at a rate of 0.4 °C/decade, that is far more rapidly than the global average (0.06 °C/decade; (IPCC, 2013)). At the same time, overall annual precipitation on the Plateau is also increasing (Chen et al., 2015), albeit with a large regional heterogeneity, from -3.4 mm/year to +4.9 mm/year (Chen et al., 2013). If these climatic trends continue, as has to be expected, the previously very cold and relatively dry ecosystems on the Tibetan Plateau will experience unprecedentedly large environmental change, affecting the homeland for ~9.8 million native people with a traditional nomadic life style (Shang et al., 2014) and the habitat of more than 50 million Tibetan sheep (Xin et al., 2011), 13 million yaks (Shang et al., 2014) and thousands of feral ungulates (Harris & Loggers, 2004). While a number of studies have investigated the effect of climate warming on rangeland quality (Klein, Harte & Zhao, 2007; Li, Liu, Frelich & Sun, 2011), few studies have examined the effects of altered precipitation regimes or the interactions between warming and precipitation changes on the Tibetan Plateau.

Rangeland quality assessment generally considers forage production and quality as two important indices (Kawamura, Watanabe, Sakanoue & Inoue, 2008; Shi et al., 2013). Forage production is the total forage biomass available to livestock over a whole year

(Kawamura, Watanabe, Sakanoue & Inoue, 2008). Forage quality is represented by the chemical constituents of forage plants that determining the feeding value of forage (Cherney & Hall, 2000). On the Tibetan Plateau, most studies so far have focused on the effects of climate change on forage production, i.e. aboveground net primary production (Li, Liu, Frelich & Sun, 2011; Wang et al., 2012; Ma et al., 2017). In contrast, very few studies have studied the effects of climate change on forage quality or combined measures of forage production and forage quality into a measure of rangeland quality, i.e. nutrient production.

Climate warming can directly and indirectly affect rangeland quality. Several meta-analyses suggest that warming can increase forage production in cold ecosystems (Lin, Xia & Wan, 2010; Lu, Zhou, Luo & Li, 2013). The mechanism of this effect can be attributed to a stimulation of plant growth (Lin, Xia & Wan, 2010; Polley et al., 2013) and enhanced availability of soil nutrients (Bai et al., 2013). However, the increased forage production may be compromised by decreased forage quality via nutrient dilution effects (Shi et al., 2013). Thus, some studies have shown that warming will not only enhance forage production, but also increase structural carbohydrates and lignification, resulting in lower forage quality (Cherney & Hall, 2000; Dumont et al., 2015). Furthermore, warming may also affect both forage production and quality by inducing shifts in plant community composition. For example, warming is reported to stimulate legume growth on the Tibetan Plateau (Wang et al., 2012), which in turn may improve forage quality (Dumont et al., 2015). Such indirect effects of climatic factors on rangeland quality may be profound, but they have often been overlooked in previous studies.

Realistic climate change scenarios should include possible changes in precipitation as well as temperature because soil humidity is one of the most important factors affecting rangeland quality. It is well known that forage production generally increases with mean annual precipitation along environmental gradients (Knapp & Smith, 2001; Bai, Han, Wu, Chen & Li, 2004; Sala, Gherardi, Reichmann, Jobbagy & Peters, 2012; Ponce-Campos et al., 2013), including those on the Tibetan Plateau (Yang, Fang, Pan & Ji, 2009; Shi et al., 2013). For forage quality, a recent meta-analysis based on 75 studies suggested that forage nitrogen content non-linearly decreases with increasing water availability, while structural carbohydrate showed an opposite trend (Dumont et al., 2015). Furthermore, similar to warming, altered precipitation regimes may lead to shifts in plant community composition and thus indirectly affect forage production and quality. For instance, some studies reported that increased precipitation can stimulate grass growth (Collins et al., 2012), which may result in lower forage quality (Deak, Hall, Sanderson & Archibald, 2007).

Little is known whether expected effects of changes in temperature and precipitation are additive or if they interact, such that the effect of one factor is increased or reduced at a particular level of the other factor (Wu, Dijkstra, Koch, Peñuelas & Hungate, 2011; Hoepfner & Dukes, 2012; Xu, Sherry, Niu, Li & Luo, 2013). For instance, warming has been reported to affect plant production only in combination with drought in a grassland in the Alps (De Boeck, Bassin, Verlinden, Zeiter & Hiltbrunner, 2016). In contrast, as will be shown in the present paper, effects of warming and altered precipitation may be more or less additive in Tibetan rangelands. Such knowledge is essential for the development of rangeland adaptation strategies that cope with climate change in the coming decades.



In our study, we assessed the potential effects of warming, altered precipitation and their interaction on rangeland quality by using a two-factor manipulative field experiment in a meadow at 3200 m altitude on the Tibetan Plateau. Our goal was to find out how forage production and quality on Tibetan rangelands responded to warming and altered precipitation regimes, in particular reduced or increased rainfall. Using our experimental results, we propose region-specific rangeland management strategies to adapt to predicted climate-change scenarios and maintain rangeland quality into the future.

## **Materials and Methods**

### ***Experimental site and design***

The experimental site is located at the Haibei Alpine Grassland Ecosystem Research Station on the northeastern Tibetan Plateau, China (101°12' E, 37°37' N, 3250 m above sea level, Fig. S1, see Supporting Information). The local climate is characterized by strong solar radiation with long cold winters and short cool summers. The growing season generally starts in mid-April and ends in late October (Wang et al., 2014). In the period 1980–2014, mean annual temperature was  $-1.2^{\circ}\text{C}$  and mean annual precipitation was 486 mm. More than 80% of the annual precipitation falls in the growing season. The alpine meadow vegetation is dominated by *Kobresia humilis*, *Elymus nutans* and *Stipa aliena*. The soil is classified as Mat-Gryic Cambisol (Chinese Soil Taxonomy) with a pH of 7.8 at 0–10 cm depth (Lin et al., 2016).

In July 2011, we set up a two-way factorial experiment with a randomized-block design to study the effects of increased annual temperature and increased or decreased annual precipitation and their interactions on the alpine meadow vegetation. The two levels

of the factor temperature are control and warming and the three levels of the factor precipitation are control and reduced or increased rainfall (see below). These six treatment combinations were applied to plots of  $1.8 \times 2.2$  m and replicated in 6 blocks for a total of 36 plots; the positions of the different treatment combinations were separately randomized in each block. There are 1.2 m buffer belt between blocks and 2.5 m buffer belt between plots.

We use overhead infrared heaters to simulate warming. In each warmed plot, two medium-wave (1200 W, 220 V, 1000 mm long and 22 mm wide) infrared heaters are suspended 1.6 m above ground. In each control plot, two ‘dummy’ arrays are suspended to mimic shading and other non-warming effects of the heaters. Soil temperature and moisture at 5, 10, and 20 cm are automatically recorded per hour by data loggers (EM 50, Decagon Devices Inc., Pullman, WA, USA). Compared to the control, warming increases soil temperature by ca. 1.5–1.8 °C at 5 cm depth (Lin et al., 2016; also see Fig. S2). To manipulate precipitation, we use rainout-shelters consisting of four transparent panlite sheet channels (PC-1151, Teijin chemicals, Tokyo, Japan) at an angle of 15°, covering 50% of the plot area. In the reduced-precipitation treatment, the shelter intercepts 50% rainfall, which flows into a white plastic rain collector. The rainfall withheld from a reduced-precipitation plot is added to an increased-precipitation plot, providing it with 50% additional rainfall. In control-precipitation plots, four ‘dummy’ channels with holes were installed to mimic shading and other not precipitation-related effects of the channels.

### ***Response variables***

We used the total aboveground live biomass at the peak of growing season (late

August) to represent forage production, because the peak aboveground live biomass is a good approximation of forage production in this ecosystem (Klein, Harte & Zhao, 2007). Within each plot, we randomly sampled three  $0.15 \times 0.15$  m quadrats and clipped all live plant material. We harvested 24 plots in 2014 and 36 plots in 2015 and 2016. Plants in each plot were sorted to species and dried in the oven at 65 °C for 48 hours to achieve constant weight in the lab. Plant species were classified into the four functional groups: grasses (Poaceae), sedges (Cyperaceae), legumes (Fabaceae) and non-legume forbs (other angiosperm families). This classification is directly linked to their ecological niches or functions in the ecosystem. Grasses and sedges, although both have fibrous root systems, have different root depths. The former have deep root systems that can reach up to 80 cm in soil depth, thus can use deep soil moisture and have relative high drought tolerance, while the latter have shallow root systems and consequently have low drought resistance. Legumes have tap root systems and root nodules, which can fix nitrogen from atmosphere. Non-legume forbs have both root systems and different root depths. We did not classify plant species into palatable and non-palatable species, because all plants in our experiment were eaten by livestock.

To assess the effects of treatments on forage quality, we measured nutrient content and digestibility of the 1–3 dominant species in each functional group in 2015. These species were: *Elymus nutans* (grass), *Helictotrichon tibeticum* (grass), *Stipa aliena* (grass), *Kobresia humilis* (sedge), *Medicago archiducis-nicolai* (legume), *Oxytropis subfalcata* (legume) and *Saussurea superba* (non-legume forb). All these species are common at the study site and account for > 70% of total forage production. For each treatment

combination and the target species, we collected all aboveground plant tissues (leaves plus shoots) from the same three randomly selected blocks in late August. We analyzed crude protein, neutral detergent fiber, acid detergent fiber and acid detergent lignin of all these species. We only chose one species from each functional group (*S. aliena*, *K. humilis*, *M. archiducis-nicolai* and *S. superba*) to examine digestibility because this measurement required large amounts of sample material. Crude protein was determined with an Automatic Kjeldahl Nitrogen Determination Apparatus (Kjeltec 8100, FOSS, Höganäs, Sweden). Neutral detergent fiber, acid detergent fiber and acid detergent lignin were determined by a sequential detergent fiber analysis (Goering & Van Soest, 1970). We calculated indices for cell soluble contents, cellulose and hemicellulose (Goering & Van Soest, 1970). The digestibility of plant species was determined by *in vitro* digestive experiments (Tilley & Terry, 1963).

To assess the nutrient content at community level ( $NC_c$ ), we first calculated nutrient content at functional group level ( $NC_f$ ) using production-based weightings as explained in equation 1, then calculate community nutrient content by equation 2:

$$NC_{fij} = \sum_{k=1}^n p_k s_{ik} \quad \text{eqn 1,}$$

where  $NC_{fij}$  is the content of nutrient  $i$  in functional group  $j$ ,  $p_k$  is the relative production in 2015 of species  $k$  in functional group  $j$  and  $s_{ik}$  is the content of nutrient  $i$  of species  $k$ .  $n$  is the total number of the representative species in functional group  $j$ .

$$NC_{ci} = \sum_{j=1}^4 p_j NC_{fij} \quad \text{eqn 2,}$$

where  $NC_{ci}$  is the content of nutrient  $i$  at community level,  $p_j$  is the relative production in

2015 of functional group  $j$  and 4 is the number of functional groups. The community digestibility was assessed by the same method.

To synthesize forage production and forage quality, we calculated community nutrient production ( $NP$ ) to assess rangeland quality as explained in equation 3:

$$NP_i = NC_{ci}F \quad \text{eqn 3,}$$

where  $NP_i$  is the production of nutrient  $i$ ,  $NC_{ci}$  is the content of nutrient  $i$  at community level and  $F$  is the forage production in 2015.

### ***Statistical analyses***

We used repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the main and the interactive effects of experimental warming, altered precipitation and sampling year (2014–2016) on the forage production of the total plant community and the four functional groups separately. Two-way ANOVA was used to examine the main and the interactive effects of experimental warming and altered precipitation on the digestibility, nutrient content and nutrient production in 2015. In the repeated-measures analysis, warming and altered precipitation were treated as fixed-effects between-subject factors and tested against the random-effects factor plot (subject), which was nested within the random-effects factor block. We used Tukey's tests to determine whether the differences between treatments were significant. Square-root or log transformations were used for response variables if this improved residual distributions with regard to homoscedasticity and normality (Schmid, Baruffol, Wang & Niklaus, 2017). Variation in community nutrient content was decomposed into two categories according to the influencing explanatory variables, i.e. climatic factors (experimental treatments of warming and altered precipitation) and

community composition (production of grasses, sedges, legumes and non-legume forbs), by partial regression with a redundancy analysis ('vegan' package in the R software; (Oksanen et al., 2013)). The variables to characterize community composition were previously identified by forward selection. All statistical analyses were conducted in R 3.2.2 (R Core Team, 2015).

## Results

### *Effects of warming and altered precipitation on forage production*

Forage production significantly responded to warming and altered precipitation (see Table 1). The effects of warming and precipitation were additive, that is their interaction was statistically not significant for either total production or functional group productions (Table 1). Although warming had no detectable effect on total forage production, it significantly increased legume production by 96.7% and decreased non-legume forb production by 25.6% (Fig. 1a). Increased precipitation enhanced total forage production by 18.2%, while reduced precipitation decreased it by 12.9% (Fig. 1b). At the level of the different plant functional groups, increased precipitation enhanced grass production by 28.7% compared to the control treatment, while reduced precipitation decreased grass and sedge production by 19.5% and 27.9%, respectively. In contrast to the other functional groups, legumes reduced forage production from dry to control to wet along the precipitation treatments (Fig. 1b; for 2015 see Fig. S3). Besides, the inter-annual variation in forage production was mainly induced by the high variation of annual precipitation (Fig. S4).

### ***Effects of warming and altered precipitation on nutrient content***

Forage quality components in terms of plant nutrient contents (amounts per unit biomass) and digestibility highly varied among plant species (Fig. 2, S4). According to the nutrient content ranking, legumes had the highest nutritive value, followed by non-legume forbs, sedges and grasses (Fig. S5). As expected, the response direction and magnitude of quality components to warming, altered precipitation and their interactions were specific to different plant species (Table S1, S2; Figs 2–3).

Despite these different specific responses of plant species to warming and precipitation treatments, there were also some consistent overall effects of these treatments on nutrient contents at community level (Table 2 upper part, Fig. 4a, b). Thus, warming increased crude protein content from 8.6% to 9.2%. In addition, crude protein content declined from dry to control to wet along the precipitation treatments and a significant interaction between warming and precipitation treatments indicated that the positive effect of warming was lost under increased precipitation (Fig. S6). From dry to control, cell soluble contents, lignin content and digestibility decreased from 42.6% to 39.3%, 7.9% to 7.2% and 48.8% to 43.3%, respectively, and cellulose content increased from 21.3% to 24.1%. Overall, warming and reduced precipitation, especially under concurrent condition, increased forage quality in terms of nutrient contents. However, although nutrient production was increased with increasing precipitation as shown below, it was at the expense of reduced forage quality.

Using variation partitioning analysis, we further quantified the contributions of climate change and community composition to the variation of forage quality in terms of nutrient

contents. The amount of variation captured by all selected variables was 93.5% for overall nutrient content (from 89.4 to 94.2% for individual nutrients; Fig. 5). The pure effects of community composition accounted for 69.1% of variation (from 32.6 to 81.4% for individual nutrients), while the pure effects of climatic factors only account for 3.3% of variation (from 0.2% to 15.5% for individual nutrients). In addition, the joint effects of climate and community composition accounted for 21.1% variation (from 7.5 to 58.9% for individual nutrients). Therefore, the variation of nutrient contents was mainly explained by differences in community composition, which was, however, itself affected by the climatic factors, i.e. warming and precipitation treatments (see Table 1 and Fig. 1).

### ***Effects of warming and altered precipitation on nutrient production***

Rangeland quality was assessed by community nutrient production, which integrated forage production and forage quality. Warming and altered precipitation significantly affected nutrient production (Table 2 lower part, Fig. 4c, d). Warming increased crude protein production by 11.7% but had no significant effects on the production of other nutrient components. Compared to the control treatment, increased precipitation enhanced cell soluble contents, hemicellulose, cellulose and lignin production by 15.6%, 18.1%, 19.0% and 15.6%, respectively, and reduced precipitation decreased hemicellulose and cellulose production by 13.4% and 19.6%, respectively. Overall, warming and increased precipitation improved Tibetan rangeland quality in terms of nutrient production, while reduced precipitation decreased it.

## **Discussion**



Rangeland quality is anticipated to potentially be strongly impacted by climate warming and altered precipitation (Briske et al., 2015). While increasing precipitation is widely reported to improve rangeland quality, the effects of warming generally depend on local temperature and precipitation regimes. Specifically, warming is expected to improve rangeland quality in cold and humid regions, but decrease it in warm and arid regions (Polley et al., 2013; Briske et al., 2015). Our study on the cold but relatively dry Tibetan Plateau suggest that, in comparison with these current climatic conditions, future warming together with increased precipitation will improve rangeland quality, whereas a less likely decrease in precipitation would decrease it. Furthermore, we found that warming and altered precipitation impacted rangeland quality by different mechanisms: warming affected forage and rangeland quality, i.e. plant nutrient content and production, in similar ways (see Fig. 4a, c), while altered precipitation affected them differentially (see Fig. 4b, d). Decreased forage production under reduced precipitation (see Fig. 1b) led to increased nutrient contents, thus maintaining nutrient production close to the control treatment. In contrast, increased precipitation increased forage production and because this only led to a slight dilution of nutrients, it had a positive effect on nutrient production. Given the important role of livestock husbandry on the Tibetan Plateau (Qiu, 2016), effective adaptation strategies are required to cope with challenges and opportunities of future climate change in this high-elevation grassland ecosystem.

### ***Increased rangeland quality due to warming-induced community shifts to legumes***

Our study showed that warming improved rangeland quality, through increased plant nutrient content (forage quality), rather than increased plant biomass (forage production).

Similar observations have been made in other studies from the Tibetan plateau (Li, Liu, Frelich & Sun, 2011; Shi et al., 2015) and Arctic tundra (Chapin, Shaver, Giblin, Nadelhoffer & Laundre, 1995; Welker, Fahnestock, Sullivan & Chimner, 2005), however, the mechanisms were different. Warming improved forage quality mainly due to accelerated net nitrogen (N) mineralization and increased available soil nutrients in Arctic tundra (Natali, Schuur & Rubin, 2012), but this was not the case in our system, where no detectable effect on net N mineralization under warming treatment has been observed (Wang et al., 2012). Rather, we found that a shift in community composition towards increased legume biomass with high nutrient contents was responsible for the improved forage quality at community level (see Fig. 6). In addition, other mechanisms might also have contributed to this effect, including warming-induced increases in N content during plant senescence as observed in other alpine grasslands (Shi et al., 2015).

Another study carried out in the same ecosystem found that warming decreased rangeland quality due to a reduction of both forage production and forage quality (Klein, Harte & Zhao, 2007). These contrasting results might be attributed to the following two reasons: first, Klein, Harte, and Zhao (2007) used open-top chambers (OTC) to simulate warming, which in contrast to infrared heaters increase air temperature more than soil temperature and additionally reduce wind speed (Marion et al., 1997; Wan, Luo & Wallace, 2002), further increasing air temperature up to 7 °C (Klein, Harte & Zhao, 2005). However, alpine plants, especially tall graminoids, are sensitive to heat stress (Wang et al., 2012). Second, the different species measured in these two studies may cause different results regarding forage quality. We found that legume forage had the highest quality among the

studied four functional groups in the alpine meadow. Warming almost doubled legume production and consequently improved forage quality at community level. However, Klein, Harte, and Zhao (2007) chose a non-legume forb, *Gentiana straminea*, to represent the quality of the combined legume plus non-legume functional group of forbs. Hence, they did not examine the potential effects of changes in legume production on forage quality under their warming treatment. In contrast, our study emphasizes the great importance of legume production to Tibetan rangelands.

The warming-increased legume production may be particularly relevant in this high-elevation ecosystem, because Tibetan rangelands under the current low-temperature climatic conditions have lower legume production than most natural grasslands around the world (Jin et al., 2013). Our results, along with previous studies (Wang et al., 2012; Jin et al., 2013), provide strong evidence that a warmer climate can benefit legumes and consequently improve Tibetan rangeland quality. Obviously, this beneficial local effect should be compared with potentially negative effects at regional to global scales such as thawing of permafrost and loss of soil carbon to the atmosphere (Schuur et al., 2015), potential effects that were outside the scope of the present study.

#### ***Improved rangeland quality due to precipitation-induced forage production***

A global meta-analysis reported that cold ecosystems are more responsive to altered precipitation (Wu, Dijkstra, Koch, Peñuelas & Hungate, 2011). In line with previous studies (Knapp & Smith, 2001; Bai, Han, Wu, Chen & Li, 2004; Yang, Fang, Pan & Ji, 2009; Ponce-Campos et al., 2013), we found that increased precipitation enhanced forage production. The positive response of forage production mainly resulted from a strong

increase of grass production, which accounted for 63% of forage production in control plots and for 69% in wetter plots. Similar observations were made in long-term rainfall experiments in the steppes of Inner Mongolia (Yang et al., 2011) and Patagonia (Yahdjian & Sala, 2006) and in Kansas prairies (Collins et al., 2012). Reduced precipitation decreased forage production due to suppressed grass production. This result is comparable with similar findings in drought experiments in steppes in Colorado (Evans, Byrne, Lauenroth & Burke, 2011) and high-elevation grassland in the Alps (De Boeck, Bassin, Verlinden, Zeiter & Hiltbrunner, 2016). Further evidence shows that forage production is generally more responsive to increased rather than reduced precipitation (Wu, Dijkstra, Koch, Peñuelas & Hungate, 2011; Unger & Jongen, 2015) and this is also what we found in our study.

Forage quality was only weakly affected by altered precipitation, which therefore had similar effects on rangeland productivity and rangeland quality (see Fig. 6). Nevertheless, the decreased forage production under reduced precipitation, after five consecutive years of treatment, was at least partly compensated by improved forage quality (see Fig. 4b), thus maintaining relatively constant nutrient production (see Fig. 4d). Other studies suggested that more severe drought over long time can accelerate plant senescence, resulting in a decline not only of forage production but also of forage quality (Polley et al., 2013). A reason for the improved forage quality in our study was the shift in community composition towards higher legume abundance, a functional group with generally high quality (Deak, Hall, Sanderson & Archibald, 2007), induced by long-term drought.

Our results suggest that a future wetter climate will be beneficial to rangeland quality, while a future dryer climate could induce forage deficiency. Without efficient adaptation

strategies, overgrazing may be more frequent and severe in dryer regions, resulting in accelerated rangeland degradation (Li et al., 2013; Shang et al., 2014). Therefore, local government should pay more attention to balance the stocking rate and forage production in those reduced precipitation regions on the Tibetan Plateau.

### ***Implications for rangeland management***

Our study provides experimental evidence that a warmer and wetter climate, which is anticipated as a general trend in the coming decades (Chen et al., 2015), could improve rangeland quality, while a drier climate could decrease it. Although climate warming is widely observed throughout the Tibetan Plateau, there is large geographical heterogeneity of precipitation (Chen et al., 2015). In the central, northern and southeastern parts, precipitation has increased since 1960, however, in the western part and eastern periphery, opposite trends of precipitation have been observed (Xu, Gong & Li, 2008; Chen et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2015). Here, we propose several adaptation strategies based on geographically specific predictions of climate change and the possible responses of alpine grassland as found in the present study.

First, in low elevations and those mesic and wet regions, reseeding native legumes such as *M. archiducis-nicolai* and *Astragalus tanguticus* can be a promising approach to improve the quality of degraded rangelands. A warmer climate can reduce low-temperature stress on legume growth (Jin et al., 2013) and make it possible to transform degraded grassland to higher quality rangeland. Reseeding legumes in degraded meadow grassland has been proved feasible in several cold ecosystems in the northern China (Wang, Sun, An, Nuer & Chen, 2011).

Second, the government can popularize artificial pastures by providing free forage seed, technological services and financial support in humid regions such as southeast part of the Plateau (Xu, Gong & Li, 2008) to mitigate forage deficiency and reduce the grazing pressure on natural grassland. Moreover, beyond those suitable planting areas in place today, policy-makers should build sound future development planning for the regions that are projected to increase precipitation in coming decades.

Third, in progressively dryer regions such as northwestern part of the Plateau (Chen et al., 2013), on one hand, the government should project to establish regional forage reserves by storing forages from artificial pastures to provide supplementary food to livestock in need in late winter and early spring (Shang et al., 2014). On the other hand, the government can increase eco-compensation and diversify livelihood of nomads, such as developing eco-tourism to reduce stocking rate, but maintain nomads' living standards at the same time.

There is no doubt that the success of implementing these management practices relies on strict regulation and supervision. In addition, strengthening regional collaboration and raising public awareness of climate change issues can further contribute to the adaptation of the livestock husbandry to climate change on the Tibetan Plateau.

**Author Contributions:** J.-S. H. conceived the ideas and designed methodology; W. X., M. Z., Z. Z., Z. M. and H. L. collected the data; W. X. analyzed the data; W. X., M. Z. and J.-S. H. led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

### ***Acknowledgements***

This research was funded by the National Basic Research Program of China (2014CB954000) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (31630009, 31570394 and 31321061). It was further supported by the 111 Project of China (Grant No. B14001) and the University Research Priority Program “Global Change and Biodiversity” of the University of Zurich.

### ***Data accessibility***

We intend to archive our data in the Dryad Digital Repository, if our paper is accepted for publication.

## References

- Bai, E., Li, S., Xu, W., Li, W., Dai, W. & Jiang, P. (2013). A meta-analysis of experimental warming effects on terrestrial nitrogen pools and dynamics. *New Phytologist*, 199, 441-451.
- Bai, Y., Han, X., Wu, J., Chen, Z. & Li, L. (2004). Ecosystem stability and compensatory effects in the Inner Mongolia grassland. *Nature*, 431, 181-184.
- Briske, D.D., Joyce, L.A., Polley, H.W., Brown, J.R., Wolter, K., Morgan, J.A., . . . Bailey, D.W. (2015). Climate-change adaptation on rangelands: linking regional exposure with diverse adaptive capacity. *Frontiers in Ecology & the Environment*, 13, 249-256.
- Chapin, F.S., III, Shaver, G.R., Giblin, A.E., Nadelhoffer, K.J. & Laundre, J.A. (1995). Responses of arctic tundra to experimental and observed changes in climate. *Ecology*, 76, 694-711.
- Chen, D., Xu, B., Yao, T., Guo, Z., Cui, P., Chen, F., . . . Zhang, T. (2015). Assessment of past, present and future environmental changes on the Tibetan Plateau. *Chinese Science Bulletin (Chinese Version)*, 60, 3025-3035.
- Chen, H., Zhu, Q., Peng, C., Wu, N., Wang, Y., Fang, X., . . . Wu, J. (2013). The impacts of climate change and human activities on biogeochemical cycles on the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau. *Global Change Biology*, 19, 2940-2955.
- Cherney, J. & Hall, M. (2000). Forage quality in perspective. *Agronomy Facts*, 30, 1-4.
- Collins, S.L., Koerner, S.E., Plaut, J.A., Okie, J.G., Brese, D., Calabrese, L.B., . . . Nonaka, E. (2012). Stability of tallgrass prairie during a 19-year increase in growing season



precipitation. *Functional Ecology*, 26, 1450-1459.

De Boeck, H.J., Bassin, S., Verlinden, M., Zeiter, M. & Hiltbrunner, E. (2016). Simulated heat waves affected alpine grassland only in combination with drought. *New Phytologist*, 209, 531-541.

Deak, A., Hall, M.H., Sanderson, M.A. & Archibald, D.D. (2007). Production and nutritive value of grazed simple and complex forage mixtures. *Agronomy Journal*, 99, 814-821.

Dong, M., Jiang, Y., Zheng, C. & Zhang, D. (2012). Trends in the thermal growing season throughout the Tibetan Plateau during 1960-2009. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 166, 201-206.

Dumont, B., Andueza, D., Niderkorn, V., Lüscher, A., Porqueddu, C. & Picon-Cochard, C. (2015). A meta-analysis of climate change effects on forage quality in grasslands: specificities of mountain and Mediterranean areas. *Grass and Forage Science*, 70, 239-254.

Evans, S.E., Byrne, K.M., Lauenroth, W.K. & Burke, I.C. (2011). Defining the limit to resistance in a drought-tolerant grassland: long-term severe drought significantly reduces the dominant species and increases ruderals. *Journal of Ecology*, 99, 1500-1507.

Goering, H.K. & Van Soest, P.J. (1970). *Forage fiber analyses: apparatus, reagents, procedures, and some applications*. USDA Agriculture Handbook NO. 379, Washington, D.C., USA.

Harris, R.B. & Loggers, C.O. (2004). Status of Tibetan Plateau mammals in Yeniugou,

488 China. *Wildlife Biology*, 10, 91-99.

489 Hoepfner, S.S. & Dukes, J.S. (2012). Interactive responses of old-field plant growth and  
 490 composition to warming and precipitation. *Global Change Biology*, 18, 1754-1768.

491 IPCC (2013). *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working*  
 492 *Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate*  
 493 *Change*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

494 Jin, D., Ma, J., Ma, W., Liang, C., Shi, Y. & He, J.-S. (2013). Legumes in Chinese natural  
 495 grasslands: species, biomass, and distribution. *Rangeland Ecology & Management*,  
 496 66, 648-656.

497 Kawamura, K., Watanabe, N., Sakanoue, S. & Inoue, Y. (2008). Estimating forage biomass  
 498 and quality in a mixed sown pasture based on partial least squares regression with  
 499 waveband selection. *Grassland Science*, 54, 131-145.

500 Klein, J.A., Harte, J. & Zhao, X.Q. (2005). Dynamic and complex microclimate responses  
 501 to warming and grazing manipulations. *Global Change Biology*, 11, 1440-1451.

502 Klein, J.A., Harte, J. & Zhao, X.Q. (2007). Experimental warming, not grazing, decreases  
 503 rangeland quality on the Tibetan Plateau. *Ecological Applications*, 17, 541-557.

504 Knapp, A.K. & Smith, M.D. (2001). Variation among biomes in temporal dynamics of  
 505 aboveground primary production. *Science*, 291, 481-484.

506 Li, G., Liu, Y., Frelich, L.E. & Sun, S. (2011). Experimental warming induces degradation  
 507 of a Tibetan alpine meadow through trophic interactions. *Journal of Applied*  
 508 *Ecology*, 48, 659-667.

509 Li, X.-L., Gao, J., Brierley, G., Qiao, Y.M., Zhang, J. & Yang, Y.W. (2013). Rangeland

510 degradation on the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau: implications for rehabilitation. *Land*  
511 *Degradation & Development*, 24, 72-80.

512 Lin, D., Xia, J. & Wan, S. (2010). Climate warming and biomass accumulation of terrestrial  
513 plants: a meta-analysis. *New Phytologist*, 188, 187-198.

514 Lin, L., Zhu, B., Chen, C., Zhang, Z., Wang, Q.B. & He, J.-S. (2016). Precipitation  
515 overrides warming in mediating soil nitrogen pools in an alpine grassland  
516 ecosystem on the Tibetan Plateau. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 31438.

517 Lu, M., Zhou, X., Luo, Y. & Li, B. (2013). Responses of ecosystem carbon cycle to  
518 experimental warming: a meta-analysis. *Ecology*, 94, 726-738.

519 Ma, Z., Liu, H., Mi, Z., Zhang, Z., Wang, Y., Xu, W., . . . He, J.-S. (2017). Climate warming  
520 reduces the temporal stability of plant community biomass production. *Nature*  
521 *Communications*, 8, 15378.

522 Marion, G., Henry, G., Freckman, D., Johnstone, J., Jones, G., Jones, M., . . . Parsons, A.  
523 (1997). Open-top designs for manipulating field temperature in high-latitude  
524 ecosystems. *Global Change Biology*, 3, 20-32.

525 Natali, S.M., Schuur, E.A.G. & Rubin, R.L. (2012). Increased plant productivity in Alaskan  
526 tundra as a result of experimental warming of soil and permafrost. *Journal of*  
527 *Ecology*, 100, 488-498.

528 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., . . .  
529 Wagner, H. (2013). Vegan: community ecology package. R package version. 2.0-10.  
530 *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48, 1-21.

531 Pettoirelli, N. (2012). Climate change as a main driver of ecological research. *Journal of*

532           *Applied Ecology*, 49, 542-545.

533   Polley, H.W., Briske, D.D., Morgan, J.A., Wolter, K., Bailey, D.W. & Brown, J.R. (2013).

534           Climate change and North American rangelands: trends, projections, and

535           implications. *Rangeland Ecology & Management*, 66, 493-511.

536   Ponce-Campos, G.E., Moran, M.S., Huete, A., Zhang, Y., Bresloff, C., Huxman, T.E., . . .

537           Gunter, S.A. (2013). Ecosystem resilience despite large-scale altered hydroclimatic

538           conditions. *Nature*, 494, 349-352.

539   Qiu, J. (2016). Trouble in Tibet. *Nature*, 529, 142-145.

540   Reichstein, M., Bahn, M., Ciais, P., Frank, D., Mahecha, M.D., Seneviratne, S.I., . . . Frank,

541           D.C. (2013). Climate extremes and the carbon cycle. *Nature*, 500, 287-295.

542   Sala, O.E., Gherardi, L.A., Reichmann, L., Jobbagy, E. & Peters, D. (2012). Legacies of

543           precipitation fluctuations on primary production: theory and data synthesis.

544           *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 3135-

545           3144.

546   Schmid, B., Baruffol, M., Wang, Z. & Niklaus, P.A. (2017). A guide to analyzing

547           biodiversity experiments. *Journal of Plant Ecology*, 10, 91-110.

548   Schuur, E.A., McGuire, A.D., Schädel, C., Grosse, G., Harden, J.W., Hayes, D.J., . . .

549           Lawrence, D.M. (2015). Climate change and the permafrost carbon feedback.

550           *Nature*, 2015, 171-179.

551   Shang, Z.H., Gibb, M.J., Leiber, F., Ismail, M., Ding, L.M., Guo, X.S. & Long, R.J. (2014).

552           The sustainable development of grassland-livestock systems on the Tibetan Plateau:

553           problems, strategies and prospects. *Rangeland Journal*, 36, 267-296.

- 554 Shi, C., Silva, L.C.R., Zhang, H., Zheng, Q., Xiao, B., Wu, N. & Sun, G. (2015). Climate  
555 warming alters nitrogen dynamics and total non-structural carbohydrate  
556 accumulations of perennial herbs of distinctive functional groups during the plant  
557 senescence in autumn in an alpine meadow of the Tibetan Plateau, China.  
558 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 200, 21-29.
- 559 Shi, Y., Ma, Y., Ma, W., Liang, C., Zhao, X.Q., Fang, J. & He, J.-S. (2013). Large scale  
560 patterns of forage yield and quality across Chinese grasslands. *Chinese Science*  
561 *Bulletin*, 58, 1187-1199.
- 562 Tilley, J. & Terry, R. (1963). A two-stage technique for the in vitro digestion of forage  
563 crops. *Grass and Forage Science*, 18, 104-111.
- 564 Unger, S. & Jongen, M. (2015). Consequences of changing precipitation patterns for  
565 ecosystem functioning in grasslands: a review. In U. Lüttge & W. Beyschlag (Eds.),  
566 *Progress in botany* (pp. 347-393). Heidelberg, BW: Springer Verlag.
- 567 Wan, S., Luo, Y. & Wallace, L. (2002). Changes in microclimate induced by experimental  
568 warming and clipping in tallgrass prairie. *Global Change Biology*, 8, 754-768.
- 569 Wang, J., Sun, Z., An, S., Nuer, J. & Chen, A. (2011). Primary studies on the resuming  
570 effect of reseeded on vegetational restoration of natural grassland. *Xinjiang*  
571 *Agricultural Sciences*, 48, 690-695.
- 572 Wang, S., Duan, J., Xu, G., Wang, Y., Zhang, Z., Rui, Y., . . . Wang, W. (2012). Effects of  
573 warming and grazing on soil N availability, species composition, and ANPP in an  
574 alpine meadow. *Ecology*, 93, 2365-2376.
- 575 Wang, Y., Liu, H., Chung, H., Yu, L., Mi, Z., Geng, Y., . . . He, J.-S. (2014). Non-growing-

576 season soil respiration is controlled by freezing and thawing processes in the  
 577 summer monsoon-dominated Tibetan alpine grassland. *Global Biogeochemical*  
 578 *Cycles*, 28, 1081-1095.

579 Welker, J.M., Fahnestock, J.T., Sullivan, P.F. & Chimner, R.A. (2005). Leaf mineral  
 580 nutrition of arctic plants in response to warming and deeper snow in northern  
 581 Alaska. *Oikos*, 109, 168-177.

582 Wu, Z., Dijkstra, P., Koch, G.W., Peñuelas, J. & Hungate, B.A. (2011). Responses of  
 583 terrestrial ecosystems to temperature and precipitation change: a meta-analysis of  
 584 experimental manipulation. *Global Change Biology*, 17, 927-942.

585 Xin, G.S., Long, R.J., Guo, X.S., Irvine, J., Ding, L.M., Ding, L.L. & Shang, Z.H. (2011).  
 586 Blood mineral status of grazing Tibetan sheep in the northeast of the Qinghai-  
 587 Tibetan Plateau. *Livestock Science*, 136, 102-107.

588 Xu, X., Sherry, R.A., Niu, S., Li, D. & Luo, Y. (2013). Net primary productivity and rain-  
 589 use efficiency as affected by warming, altered precipitation, and clipping in a  
 590 mixed-grass prairie. *Global Change Biology*, 19, 2753-2764.

591 Xu, Z.X., Gong, T.L. & Li, J.Y. (2008). Decadal trend of climate in the Tibetan Plateau—  
 592 regional temperature and precipitation. *Hydrological Processes*, 22, 3056-3065.

593 Yahdjian, L. & Sala, O.E. (2006). Vegetation structure constrains primary production  
 594 response to water availability in the Patagonian steppe. *Ecology*, 87, 952-962.

595 Yang, H., Wu, M., Liu, W., Zhang, Z., Zhang, N. & Wan, S. (2011). Community structure  
 596 and composition in response to climate change in a temperate steppe. *Global*  
 597 *Change Biology*, 17, 452-465.

598 Yang, Y.H., Fang, J.Y., Pan, Y.D. & Ji, C.J. (2009). Aboveground biomass in Tibetan  
599 grasslands. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 73, 91-95.  
600

## Tables


**Table 1.** Results of the repeated measures ANOVA for responses of forage production ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) of the total plant community and plant functional groups to warming and altered precipitation from 2014 to 2016. Table entries are  $F$ -values and their significances: \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

	Warming (W)	Precipitation (P)	W * P	Year (Y)	W * Y	P * Y	W * P * Y
Total	1.140	<b>20.419***</b>	0.054	<b>10.275**</b>	0.513	1.302	<b>3.281*</b>
Grass	0.626	<b>25.811***</b>	0.224	<b>14.417***</b>	0.444	0.236	2.585
Sedge	2.509	<b>3.273*</b>	2.737	0.305	0.548	0.717	0.628
Legume	<b>36.307***</b>	<b>6.496**</b>	0.754	1.842	0.002	1.245	0.604
Non-legume forb	<b>12.078***</b>	<b>3.839*</b>	2.536	0.789	1.248	<b>3.113*</b>	0.046



**Table 2.** ANOVA results for responses of community nutrient content (%) and nutrient production ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) to warming and altered precipitation. Table entries are *F*-values and their significances: \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

	Crude protein	Cell soluble contents	Hemicellulose	Cellulose	Lignin
<b>Content (%)</b>					
Warming (W)	<b>18.250***</b>	0.901	0.423	0.262	2.050
Precipitation (P)	<b>32.410***</b>	<b>5.879**</b>	2.482	<b>19.964***</b>	<b>21.909***</b>
W * P	<b>13.210***</b>	2.454	1.501	1.661	0.543
<b>Production (<math>\text{g m}^{-2}</math>)</b>					
Warming (W)	<b>5.910*</b>	2.235	1.089	1.290	2.881
Precipitation (P)	2.813	<b>4.331*</b>	<b>13.353***</b>	<b>20.952***</b>	<b>5.136*</b>
W * P	1.010	0.523	0.626	0.189	0.272




612

613 **Figure 1.** The main effects of warming (a) and altered precipitation (b) on forage


614 production of the total plant community and four plant functional groups. Bars represent

615 mean  $\pm$  SE values averaged across 2014–2016. Different letters or asterisks represent

616 significant differences: different letters,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .




**Figure 2.** The main effects of warming (a) and altered precipitation (b) on the digestibility of the total plant community and representative species from the four plant functional groups (from left to right the four species represent grasses, sedges, legumes and non-legume forbs). Bars represent mean  $\pm$  SE values. Different letters or asterisks represent significant differences: different letters,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .




**Figure 3.** The main effects of warming (a) and altered precipitation (b) on nutrient contents of the dominant species *Stipa aliena*, *Elymus nutans*, *Helictotrichon tibeticum*, *Kobresia humilis*, *Medicago archiducis-nicolai*, *Oxytropis subfalcata* and *Saussurea superba*. Bars represent the difference between global-change and control treatments. Significance: \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .






**Figure 4.** The main effect of warming and altered precipitation on community nutrient content (a, b) and community nutrient production (c, d). Bars represent mean  $\pm$  SE values. Different letters or asterisks represent significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ ).



**Figure 5.** Results of variation partitioning for total plant community nutrient content (a), crude-protein content (b), cell-soluble nutrient content (c), hemicellulose content (d), cellulose content (e) and lignin content (f) in terms of fractions of variation explained. Variation is explained by four categories: pure effects of experimentally manipulated climatic factors ( $X_1$ ), pure effects of community composition ( $X_2$ ), joint effect of climatic factors and community composition ( $X_3$ ) and residual variation.



**Figure 6.** Summary of impacts of warming and altered precipitation on Tibetan rangeland quality, emphasizing the regulating paths. Warming and precipitation affect forage quality mainly by shifting community composition. Forage production is influenced by altered precipitation, but not by warming. The content in the box shows responses in community composition under climate change. The widths of lines and arrows correspond to effect sizes. Solid lines indicate significant effects and the dashed line indicates a non-significant effect.

## Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article:

**Table S1.** ANOVA results for the treatment effects on nutrient contents of representative species.

**Table S2.** ANOVA results for the treatment effects on the digestibility of representative species.

**Fig. S1.** Location of the field site on the Tibetan Plateau.

**Fig. S2.** The effect of warming on soil temperature.

**Fig. S3.** The main effects of warming (a) and altered precipitation (b) on forage production of the total plant community and four plant functional groups in 2015.

**Fig. S4.** Annual precipitation from 2014 to 2016.

**Fig. S5.** The variation of nutrient contents among the representative plant species.

**Fig. S6.** The interactive effects of warming and altered precipitation on total plant community crude protein content.